REMARKS

I. Status Summary

Claims 14-19 and 33-36 are pending in the present application and presently stand rejected. Claims 14, 18, 33, 35 and 36 have been amended by this amendment, and new claims 37 and 38 have been added. Reconsideration of the application as amended and based on the arguments set forth herein is respectfully requested.

II. Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 14-19 and 33-36 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,521,844 to Karis (hereinafter, "Karis") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,946,661 to Rothschild et al. (hereinafter, "Rothschild"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

With respect to independent claim 14, the Action states that Karis teaches a method comprising analyzing time-tagged data associated a plurality of machines of different types associated with a mail or paper processing system as the Action references Figure 14 of Karis. The Action also states that the method of Karis comprises displaying a first window including parameter descriptions for mail or paper processing parameter values produced from the analysis of time-tagged data, and including status information indicating the results of comparing the results of the parameter values to reference values as Figure 14 of Karis is again referenced. The Action further states that the method of Karis comprises displaying a third window including a graph of measured values for the selected perimeter description as the Figure 15 of Karis is referenced. Finally, the Action indicates that the method of Karis

comprises receiving input from a user for selecting the parameter description, and the Figure 15 of Karis is noted as a graph that can be selected during the monitor routine as the graph illustrates the tension history obtained for a particular role from the start of the role on the press. The Action acknowledges, however, that Karis fails to disclose displaying a table of statistical measures for a selected perimeter description produced from the analysis of time-tagged data. The Action states that Karis does already graph such data, but that the display of the data is not in a table format. According to the Action, it is inherent in Karis that this data exists, because a graph of the data is drawn. Rothschild is relied upon though for disclosing a window including a table of statistical measures for a selected perimeter as Figure 10 of Rothschild is referenced. The Action concludes that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Karis with the teachings of Rothschild to include a table for the selected parameter with the motivation to provide a user with a more detailed description about that selected parameter.

As set forth above, independent claim 14 has been amended to better clarify the present subject matter. More specifically, paragraph (a) of independent claim 14 now recites that analyzing time-tagged data associated with the plurality of machines comprises (i) reading a plurality of time-tagged data items received from the plurality of machines, and (ii) state machine processing the time-tagged data so as to parse the time-tagged data items to identify at least one event of interest for a particular machine associated with the mail or paper processing system. In addition to the distinctions noted with respect to Karis in previous amendments, there is no teaching or suggestion in Karis of analyzing time-tagged data associated with a plurality of

machines wherein the analysis comprises reading a plurality of time-tagged data items from the machines and state machine processing the time-tagged data so as to parse the time-tagged data items to identify at least one event of interest for a particular machine associated with the mail or paper processing system. Rather, Karis discloses a printing press monitoring system with a number of sensors where the system can monitor, analyze and advise an operator as to various operations of the printing press. No disclosure is made by Karis of analyzing time-tagged data from machines used in the printing press by reading time-tagged data from the machines and state machine processing the time-tagged data so as to parse the time-tagged data items to identify at least one event of interest for a particular machine associated with the mail or paper processing system. The addition of the teaching of Rothschild with the teachings of Karis fails to overcome the significant shortcomings of Karis. As such, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection of claim 14, and independent claims 15, 16 and 17, based upon a combination of Karis and Rothschild should now be withdrawn.

With regard to claim 18, claim 18 has been amended to better clarify the present subject matter. More specifically, paragraph (a) of independent claim 18 now recites that analyzing time-tagged data associated with the plurality of machines comprises (i) reading a plurality of time-tagged data items received from the plurality of machines, and (ii) state machine processing the time-tagged data so as to parse the time-tagged data items to identify multiple, separated data items relating to an event of interest for a particular machine associated with the mail or paper processing system. In addition to the distinctions noted with respect to Karis in previous

amendments, there is no teaching or suggestion in Karis of analyzing time-tagged data associated with a plurality of machines wherein the analysis comprises reading a plurality of time-tagged data items from the machines and state machine processing the time-tagged data so as to parse the time-tagged data items to identify multiple, separated data items relating to an event of interest for a particular machine associated with the mail or paper processing system. Rather, Karis discloses a printing press monitoring system with a number of sensors where the system can monitor, analyze and advise an operator as to various operations of the printing press. No disclosure is made by Karis of analyzing time-tagged data from machines used in the printing press by reading time-tagged data from the machines and state machine processing the time-tagged data so as to parse the time-tagged data items to identify multiple, separated data items relating to an event of interest for a particular machine associated with the mail or paper processing system. The addition of the teaching of Rothschild with the teachings of Karis fails to overcome the significant shortcomings of Karis. As such, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection of claim 18, and dependent claim 19, based upon a combination of Karis and Rothschild should now be withdrawn.

With regard to claim 33, the Action states that Karis teaches in a graphical user interface including a display and a user input device, a method for displaying statistical measures for selected parameter values produced from analysis of time-tagged data from a mail or paper processing system. The Action states that the method comprises analyzing time-tagged data from a plurality of machines of different types associated with a mail or paper processing system as Figure 14 of Karis is referenced. The

Action notes that Karis does not teach displaying a table of statistical measures for a selected parameter description produced from the analysis of time-tagged data. The Action states, however, it is inherent in Karis that this data exists and that it would have been obvious in light of the teachings of Rothschild to modify Karis and include a table for the selected perimeter.

As set forth above, independent claim 33 has been amended to recite that the step of paragraph (a) of analyzing the time-tagged data occurs by state machine processing the time-tagged data so as to parse the time-tagged data items to identify at least one event of interest for a particular machine and to measure a parameter of interest associated with the mail or paper processing system. In addition to the distinctions noted with respect to Karis in previous amendments, there is no teaching or suggestion in Karis of analyzing time-tagged data associated with a plurality of machines wherein the analysis comprises reading a plurality of time-tagged data items from the machines and state machine processing the time-tagged data so as to parse the time-tagged data items to identify at least one event of interest for a particular machine and to measure a parameter of interest associated with the mail or paper processing system. Rather, Karis discloses a printing press monitoring system with a number of sensors where the system can monitor, analyze and advise an operator as to various operations of the printing press. No disclosure is made by Karis of analyzing time-tagged data from machines used in the printing press by reading time-tagged data from the machines and state machine processing the time-tagged data so as to parse the time-tagged data items to identify at least one event of interest for a particular machine and to measure a parameter of interest associated with the mail or

paper processing system. The addition of the teaching of Rothschild with the teachings of Karis fails to overcome the significant shortcomings of Karis. As such, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection of claim 33, and dependent claims 34, 35, and 36, based upon Karis and Rothschild should now be withdrawn.

As set forth above, new claims 37 and 38 have been added by this amendment. Claims 37 and 38 both ultimately depend from independent claim 33. Claim 37 recites that analyzing the time-tagged data comprises generating statistical measure data by computing statistical measures of the parameter measured. Claim 38 recites that analyzing the time-tagged data comprises applying limits to the statistical measures data to identify whether the machines are operating within predetermined tolerances. It is respectfully submitted that neither Karis nor Rothschild teaches or suggests, either singly or in combination, either of these features of claim 37 or 38.

CONCLUSION

In light of the above amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is now in proper condition for allowance, and an early notice to such effect is earnestly solicited.

If any small matter should remain outstanding after the Patent Examiner has had an opportunity to review the above Remarks, the Patent Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned patent attorney in order to resolve these matters and avoid the issuance of another Official Action.

DEPOSIT ACCOUNT

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees associated with the filing of this correspondence to Deposit Account No. **50-0426**.

Respectfully submitted,

JENKINS, WILSON & TAYLOR, P.A.

Date: December 12, 2005 By: _____

Jeffrey L. Wilson
Registration No. 36,058
Customer No: 25297

1174/81/4 DIV